

AN ATTEMPT AT THE INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON OF CRIMINALITY AND RECIDIVISM

by

Mrs. KOVACSICS KATALIN NAGY

The international comparison of criminal statistical figures has been the subject of investigation by criminal statisticians for long decades. Scholars of criminal sciences hope that statistics can carry out an objective comparison of crime of different countries. The comparison of crime is a much more complicated problem than the comparison of economic, demographic and other social phenomena, considering that crime is a complex social mass phenomenon, its development is influenced by the number and composition of population, economic development, social structure, moral relations, climate etc. of the individual countries. Besides these material factors, crime and so indirectly the statistical figures measuring crime can be influenced by s.c. formal factors too, that is, the criminal codes of the countries even in the comparison of crime of peoples living in a similar social system however, the comparison of data is made complicated also by the fact in the individual countries the system of statistical observation is divergent too, just as the unit of observation and the viewpoints of grouping as well the processing systems are different.

The problem of the international comparison of crime has occurred at the sessions of the International Statistical Institute many times and earlier on the agenda of the International Statistical Congresses, e.g. at the session held in Peterburg (Leningrad), 1872, and in Budapest, 1884. At the session in Rome, 1903, A. Bosco gave an account of the crime of the European countries⁴, at the congress held in Holland in 1927, a communication entitled "Communication sur le Statistique Criminelle" was presented, then at the congress in Madrid, 1931, C. Gini and A. Spallanzani lectured on the comparison of the criminal statistical data of the different countries.⁶

In the recent past the author of this article submitted a study at the Congress of the International Statistical Institute, held in Warsaw, 1975. It contains proposals for organizing the international comparison and the system to be applied.¹⁰ The basic idea of the study is to compile a uniform international nomenclature of crime to which the national weights measuring the social dangerousness of the individual crimes should

be added. The study presents in detail the system to be applied for standardizing the natural weights which measure the scale of deviation of the national data from the average of the examined countries.

The congress on criminal law and penology organized in Prague in 1930, also dealt with the problems of building up the international criminal statistics and made a decision on organizing it. At the congress Bongers (Holland), Roesner (Germany) and Santoro (Italy) moved remarkable motions. Notable results of research were published in the 1940's by Ervin Hacker in his 12-volume series entitled "*Kriminalstatistische und Kriminal-aetiologische Berichte*". In it he makes the criminal statistical figure of the European states and numerous non-European states known, reports net crime rate (crime data for 100,000 persons) for the purpose of comparison, further on a rate named by him index number, obtained through division by the average of crime rates.^{7,8} The advantage of the latter is that it expresses the measured phenomenon in percentage. These index numbers arrange the countries in the same order as the crime rates because they came into being through the division by a constant, so they do not contain new information as compared with the crime rates.

After 1947 also the Interpol joined in the work of collecting and unifying criminal statistical data.

Finally, in 1950, a special committee was set up within the framework of UNO with a view to performing comparison on the basis of criminal statistics of certain states. In the last decades the western criminological literature has reported research based on the Sellin-Wolfgang-index. As the essence of the method is that the relative seriousness of certain crimes are evaluated by points on the basis of objective factors (the mode of commission, use of firearms, damage caused etc) and ranked by summing up the points, the method is independent of the criminal codes of the countries to be compared, which makes the comparison possible. The method practically expresses a value judgement independent of the legal regulation and based on an interview.^{19,21}

Since the Sellin-Wolfgang index spread, the international comparison has made a great progress in the field of criminal statistics. As the grouping systems based on the national code of the national official criminal statistics seem to be an unsurmountable barrier in the comparison, many think that the Sellin-Wolfgang index is the only possible way of comparison.^{1,11,12,18}

Since 1968 the European Committee of Crime Problems working within the framework of the European Council has also dealt with the idea of creating international criminal statistics based on the Sellin-Wolfgang theory. An indisputably great advantage of the Sellin - Wolfgang index is its independence of the national criminal codes but its most serious mistake - in my opinion - lies just in it because a weighing system independent of the criminal law, resting partly on the subjective value judgement of laymen cannot be regarded as realistic.

The research into the international comparison has renewed in the Hungarian special literature of late years.

Dr. Antal Bakóczy compares the data of crime against life in his study published in 1977.³ The method of comparison is the comparison of the number of wilful crimes against life (both completed and attempted forms) per 100,000 persons. The selection of this group of crimes is explained by the fact crimes against human life are prohibited by the criminal law of each country. Although the data are influenced by social, political, economic factors, yet wider and perhaps more solid opportunities offer themselves for comparing the crime against life than in the categories of other crimes. Dr. Bakóczy carries out the comparison for 29 European and 76 non-European countries, for the period of 1962–1975.

Dr. Gabriella Raskó deals with the international tendency of female crime in her article published likewise in 1977.¹⁵

According to her investigation female crime accounts for 15–18% in the most developed capitalist countries, 13–16% in Hungary, 5–7% both in the Moslem and Latin-American countries.

Comparing the data of several countries she points out that lately there has been a change in the structure of female crime, parallel with the growth of the number female offenders, the character of acts committed by them also begins to shift towards more grievous crimes, within this towards the violent, partly intellectual acts. The legal problems of comparison are widely explored by Dr. Antal Patera in his study entitled "Ideas to the International Statistical Comparison of the Data of Crime and Recidivists."¹³

The study shows in detail the deviations in the criminal law of the individual countries, in particular the deviations in the interpretation, sanctioning and statistical accounting of recidivism. He carries out statistical comparison for crimes which have become known, for some stressed crimes and offender who have become known and for those convicted validly by using crude crime rates. He presents the three-year average of recidivists with relative numbers of division compared with all the convicts.

For the primary comparison of data deriving from the divergent data-collecting systems of the different countries serve the crude and net rates. The crude rates eliminate the differences in the order of magnitude of the number of population, while the net rates compared with the population capable of committing crimes to a certain extent blunt the deviations appearing in the age division of the individual population and influencing crime.

The following two tables contain the crude and net rates of 18 European countries for the period between 1960–1972 (Table 1 Crude rates, Table 2 Net rates.) The extremely great differences between the rates of the table justify the above-mentioned by themselves: This scale of difference is not probable in crime but rather in criminal policy and statistical system.

The time-series of some of the countries in the table do not show the whole crime, but part of it, so the series of data of England Wales and Scotland contain the number of those received into prison only that is, the number of convicts sentenced to enforceable loss of liberty, which is

Table 1
Crude Criminality Rates

Year	England Wales Scotland ¹	Austria ²	Belgium	Czechoslovakia	Denmark	Finland ³	France	Greece	Holland	Poland	Norway	FRG ⁴	Italy	Portugal	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Hungary
1960		1632.2	302.5			233.5	469.3		233.0			799.3		253.8	84.7	260.2	410.4	522.5
1961		1512.8	309.3			252.8	486.2		220.9	1008.0		826.8	241.0		83.7	281.7	409.9	539.5
1962	115.2	1440.4	297.4			251.8	461.1		209.1	912.2	161.1	855.3	227.4	260.7	78.4	293.4	401.9	575.0
1963	116.6	1395.2	289.3		295.8	271.7	480.1		211.7	824.7		817.2	148.8		74.0	279.0	342.7	399.7
1964	108.9	1395.2	296.8		286.9	294.1	502.3	693.6	225.9	585.6		845.6	187.6	244.5	77.4	293.6	335.2	533.4
1965	110.6	1364.5	275.8		279.8	291.0	526.3	854.5	218.5	660.3		822.3	198.1		85.3	260.0	324.0	603.7
1966	122.3	1426.6	274.6		282.4	296.5	546.9	1084.5	222.6	783.8		866.1	169.2	224.8	91.4	292.5	318.2	651.8
1967	110.0	1468.9	307.7	494.1	282.3	319.9	585.8	1062.4	232.8	725.7		859.8	179.3		91.6	320.3	323.2	644.2
1968	91.6	1503.3	304.0	360.0	310.4	316.0	593.6	763.0	235.3	682.7		951.7	179.3	188.0	103.3	337.2	319.4	580.4
1969	98.7	1521.7	268.6	418.6	308.9	316.6	516.3	899.3	221.7	462.7		872.7	164.2		108.2	332.9	325.5	502.0
1970	107.8	1488.0		752.0		325.1	597.5	823.6	212.4	510.4	173.7	912.0	121.7	168.2	111.8	340.0	338.6	449.1
1971	108.7	1447.3		1018.5			847.0			601.6	186.7	932.3			101.8	329.8	314.5	569.3
1972		1355.3		1025.1						512.0		959.5			163.0	104.0		631.6

1 It includes only the number of persons received into prison

2 Persons convicted of a crime, misdemeanour and transgression

3 It includes only the number of those sentenced to loss of liberty

4 Data of persons over 21 only

5 It includes only the number of those convicted of a crime

Table 2

Net Criminality Rates

Year	England Wales Scot- land ¹	Aust- ria ²	Bel- gium	Czecho- slovakia	Den- mark	Finn- land ³	France	Greece	Holland	Poland	Norway	FRG ⁴	Italy	Portu- gal ⁵	Spain	Sweden	Switzer- land	Hun- gary
1960		2128	397.0			320.3	622.4		325.0			1034.0		357.5	116.7	329.0	523.3	700.4
1961		1972	405.9			346.8	644.6		306.1	1460.9		1069.6	317.9		115.3	356.1	531.6	748.4
1962	150.2	1878	390.3			345.4	611.5		291.6	1322.0	214.2	1106.5	300.0	367.2	108.0	370.9	521.3	766.9
1963	152.0	1819	379.7		388.2	372.7	636.7		295.3	1195.2		1057.2	196.3		101.9	352.7	450.3	529.9
1964	142.0	1830	389.5		376.5	403.4	666.2	1120.4	315.1	848.7		1003.9	247.5	844.4	106.6	371.2	436.0	702.4
1965	144.2	1779	361.9		367.2	399.2	698.0	1148.5	304.7	956.9		1063.8	261.3		117.5	328.7	420.2	789.6
1966	159.5	1860	360.4		370.6	406.7	725.3	1457.8	310.5	1135.9		1120.4	223.2	316.6	125.9	369.8	412.7	846.5
1967	143.4	1915	403.8	597.5	370.5	438.8	776.9	1428.0	324.7	1051.7		1112.3	236.5		126.2	404.9	419.2	831.6
1968	119.4	1960	399.0	435.3	407.3	433.5	787.3	1025.5	328.2	889.4		1231.2	236.5	264.8	142.3	426.3	414.3	745.8
1969	128.7	1984	352.5	506.2	405.4	434.3	684.7	1208.7	309.2	670.6		1129.0	216.6		149.0	420.9	422.2	640.9
1970	140.5	1940		909.3		445.9	792.4	1107.0	296.2	739.7	231.0	1179.8	160.6	236.9	154.0	429.8	439.2	568.6
1971	141.7	1887		1231.6				1138.4		871.9	248.3	1206.1			140.2	416.9	407.9	712.6
1972		1767		1239.5					742.0			1241.3		229.6	143.2			789.4

¹ It includes only the number of persons received into prison² Persons convicted of a crime, misdemeanour and transgression³ It includes only the number of those sentenced to loss of liberty⁴ Data of persons over 21 only⁵ It includes only the number of those convicted of a crime

only 2–3% of all the convicts. The number of nearly two million of all the convicted persons contains the traffic offences too, which give more than 60% of all the convicts, from them hardly more than 1% was sentenced to loss of liberty. The situation is similar as regards those convicted of petty offences accounting for about 20% of all the convicts, about 6% of them were sentenced to loss of liberty.

The data of Finland contain also the number those sentenced to loss of liberty, which amounts to about 30% of all the convicts. The data of Portugal contain only the number those convicted of a crime and it cannot be established from the sources available how many were convicted for a misdemeanour.

In other countries the extremely high rate is the consequence of the fact that their criminal codes define the notion of the crime very widely and it contains a lot of offences too, which are considered misdemeanours in our legal system.

Very high rates can be seen in the time series of Austria, France, Greece, Poland and the FRG. In the FRG nearly 50% of the criminals were convicted of traffic offences in 1969. The data of France are also very high, although they do not contain the infractions judged by magistrates. The data of Austria contain the number of criminals convicted crimes, misdemeanours and infractions drawn together. The rate counted from them is much higher than the corresponding rate of most of the neighbouring countries, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Switzerland.

18–20% of all the criminals are those convicted of crimes and misdemeanours. If we calculate a rate from these data, we shall get an essentially lower rate for the former countries. The reason for this is that in the nomenclature of the Austrian infractions there are many which are considered crimes in the Hungarian criminal law while most of them are only infractions or are not regarded at all as acts dangerous to society e.g. adultery. In evaluating criminality we have to take into consideration that crime rates depend not only on crime but also on the success of the investigating authorities, the high criminality is at the same time the consequence of successful detection. It is presumable that behind the strikingly low crime rates a low per cent of detection is hidden.

The data of Belgium, Denmark, Holland, Norway and Sweden can be compared relatively realistically. The criminality of these countries fluctuate between the following values in the examined period:

Belgium	268,6 – 309,3
Denmark	282,3 – 310,4
Holland	291,6 – 328,2
Norway	214,2 – 248,4
Sweden	328,7 – 429,8

The evaluation of the above-mentioned criminality also justifies that the international comparison of total crime comes up against a lot of difficulties.

III.

In the following chapter a highly stressed part of crime, recidivism is to be examined. Recidivism in criminal-statistical investigations is of great significance from several points of view. On the one hand, it means a more serious sort of than non-recurring crime, which is for the most part an accidentlike offence of people taking the wrong turn, on the other hand, the statistical investigation of recidivists offers an opportunity for examining the efficiency of sentences and execution of punishment.

Although the criminal law of most countries takes recidivism into account as an aggravating factor in meting out a punishment, some difficulty arises in the comparison because the notion of recidivism is defined in different ways.

It is diversely judged after how many former convictions a convict can be regarded as a recidivist, what kind of criminal prejudices accompany the offender's previous record, after what length of time an offender can be released from the prejudices attached to the past record. The criminal law of most countries interpretes recidivism as general recidivism, while others, making stipulations, add prejudices to special recidivism. From among the European legal systems only the English one has no separate rule for recidivists on the principle of infliction of punishment according to which circumstances not belonging to the act — the offender's past record included — should not influence forming a judgment of the act. Table 3 contains the rate of recidivists in the examined countries between 1960—72.

The Austrian code (of 1852) considers the previous conviction for the same offence an aggravating circumstance, in case of larceny it does the same if the relapse occurred twice. There is a possibility for raising the punishment if the relapse occurred twice, after serving the sentence dangerous recidivists can be placed in an institute secured for them.

The Belgian criminal code allows to apply a more serious punishment even if the relapse happened once, so if a person previously convicted of a crime commits only a misdemeanour, he can be punished with the double of the statutory maximum of misdemeanour.

The Czechoslovak criminal code provides an opportunity for the court not to take a previous conviction into account, whereas it makes it possible to raise the punishment by one third of the maximum set upon the crime.

According to the Danish criminal code the punishment of professional or habitual offenders can be raised by half of the statutory maximum, that of recidivists by double of the imposable punishment. The prejudice accompanying recidivism will be repealed with the passing of five years after serving the previous sentence. In Finland a non — recurrent relapse too can be an aggravating circumstance unless the offender committed his previous crime before the age of 18, or five years have passed since serving the previous sentence.

Table 3

Rate of Recidivists among the Convicts

Year	England Wales Scot- land ¹	Austria	Belgium	Czecho- slovakia	Den- mark	Fin- land ²	France	Greece	Holland	Poland	Nor- way	FRG	Italy	Portu- gal ³	Spain	Swe- den	Switzer- land	Hun- gary
1960		51	42.5			51.8	22.0		46.8					20.1	13.3	51.5	48.8	30.2
1961		52	42.6			50.6	24.9		45.4	23.4			48.0		14.0	49.5	46.3	32.6
1962	60.1	52	41.7			50.2	28.2		45.2	26.5	40.0		45.1	17.8	12.8	51.3	46.3	33.8
1963	63.9	52	43.3		20.9	49.2	30.1		43.9	28.2			52.4		13.2	52.3	46.8	31.3
1964	63.9	51	42.2		21.5	48.7	31.5		44.3	31.3			45.7	19.9	13.2	52.5	46.2	26.0
1965	61.7	50	42.5		21.5	50.0	35.1		43.2	26.9			43.5		22.1	52.2	46.6	27.0
1966	62.1	47	43.4		22.6	50.7	31.1		43.3	25.9			47.3	16.5	20.7	51.7	46.4	27.9
1967	62.6	48	44.4	41.1	24.7	52.5	27.9	15.9	42.8	28.6			48.9		20.0	52.2	46.4	29.8
1968	63.8		44.5	38.7	24.6	53.5	31.8	13.6	43.7	30.1			48.5	14.0	20.9	52.5	46.8	28.9
1969	61.7		47.0	39.5	24.5	54.1	31.4	48.7	43.8	31.6		41.4	49.0		20.6	52.2	46.4	32.4
1970	46.7			34.7			19.8	48.3	45.9	29.9	58.1		51.4	10.7	20.4	50.4	44.0	35.1
1971	50.3			30.9				44.7		31.2	57.6				21.3	51.3	45.7	27.4
1972				32.1						34.1				10.8	20.7			25.9

¹ From among those received into prison² Compared with those sentenced to loss of liberty³ From among those convicted of a crime

In France in case of a single relapse a punishment more serious than the statutory maximum can be imposed, for special recidivists the statutory maximum can be doubled.

The Greek criminal code provides the increase of punishment ordained by law in case of recidivism. It provides particularly grave consequences for the third and further relapses, when the law provides 6 months imprisonment, the recidivist can be punished with ten years of penal servitude. The prejudices can be even graver for habitual recidivists. In Holland, the punishment for a single relapse can be increased by one-third.

In Poland, the court considers the previous conviction for a wilful crime or a similar crime through negligence an aggravating circumstance.

In Norway, more seriously can be punished as recidivists those who repeatedly committed one of the crimes against life and health, sexual morals or are convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude.

The criminal code of the FRG attaches prejudices to two previous convictions. The minimum punishment of recidivists is 6 months. In case of a serious personality disorder there is a possibility for them to be placed in an institute after the serving of sentence. In some case public-security detention or probation can be ordered. In Italy, in case of a single relapse the punishment provided by law can be increased by one-sixth, in case of repeated recidivism by five-sixth, maximum.

Table 4

Average Rate of Recidivists between 1960 and 1972

Average rate of recidivists (%)

Dispersion compared with the average %	-19,9	20,0-29,9	30,0-39,9	40,0-49,9	50,0-
- 9,9				Belgium Denmark ³ Holland	Sweden Austria
10,0-19,9		Denmark ²		Finnland ⁴ Italy Switzerland	
20,0-39,9		Poland Spain Hungary	Czechoslovakia	Portugal ⁶	England ¹ Norway
40,0-99,9	Portugal ⁵	France			
100,0-			Greece		
Unknown				FRG	

¹ Compared with those received into prison² Compared with all the condemned³ Compared with those sentenced to a more serious punishment than fine⁴ Compared with those sentenced to loss of liberty⁵ Convicted of a crime⁶ Compared with those received into prison

In Portugal, recidivism is an aggravating circumstance, the release comes after 8 years. The Spanish criminal code regards both general and special recidivism as an aggravating circumstance.

The Swedish criminal code makes the raise of punishment possible in case of a single general relapse too.

In the interest of surveying the recidivism rates easily, I have grouped the individual countries on the basis of average recidivism frequency calculated from the data of 12 years the fluctuation compared with this average value (relative dispersion).

Table 4 shows that the rate of recidivists is the lowest in Portugal, Denmark, France, Poland, Hungary and Spain, the highest is in England, Austria, Norway and Sweden. The rate of recidivists shows the greatest stability in Austria, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, it is very instabil in France, Greece and Portugal.

It can be seen from the foregoing that some countries attach prejudices even to the general recidivism, others only to the special recidivism.

The criminal statistics of only Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Finnland, Poland, Italy and Spain contain data both for the general and special recidivism (table 5).

Rate of General and Special Recidivists

Table 5

Year	Belgium		Czechoslovakia		Finland		Poland		Spain	
	Offender with a past record or recidivist per 100 convicts									
	gen.	spec.	gen.	spec.	gen.	spec.	gen.	spec.	gen.	spec.
1960	22.0	20.5			22.8	29.0				
1961	22.0	20.6			22.3	28.3	15.3	8.1		
1962	21.6	20.0			21.4	28.8	17.3	9.2		
1963	22.9	20.3			20.3	28.9	18.6	9.6	9.9	55.3
1964	23.8	18.4			19.0	29.7	18.9	12.4	9.1	55.5
1965	23.5	19.0			18.9	31.1	15.7	11.2	9.1	55.7
1966	23.7	19.7			20.3	30.4	15.7	10.2	8.9	53.3
1967	24.6	19.8			22.6	29.9	17.5	11.1	9.9	49.9
1968	25.1	19.4	17.4	21.3	17.5	36.0	18.3	11.8	9.0	50.4
1969			17.8	21.8	21.1	33.0	19.2	12.4	8.6	50.1
1970			22.8	11.9			22.4	7.5	10.5	47.5
1971			19.4	11.4			23.6	7.6	8.7	50.6
1972			22.3	10.0				9.0	8.3	43.9
Average of the above men- tioned years	23.3	19.7	18.0	15.8	20.2	30.7	18.6	9.9	9.2	51.5

In Belgium, Czechoslovakia and Poland the rate of general recidivism is higher.

The data of Austria, the FRG and Portugal refer to the general recidivism, special recidivism is determined by law in the sphere of offences against property.

In Austria, the average number of the condemned for theft committed by special recidivists was 34 from among 100.000 persons of punishable age between 1964 – 1970.

In the FRG from among 100 convicted on average 1.6 committed theft as recidivist in 1967 – 69. In Portugal the rate of special recidivists in the sphere of offences against property was 14.9% on average. In the examination of recidivists there is a very important view the s.c. order of recidivism, that is, this examination shows how many times the recidivist has been punished. The criminal law of most countries states that repeated recidivism has serious legal consequences. In spite of this in the statistics of relatively few countries can be found data to this question and where there data the grouping is different, accordingly the following countries give data about recidivism. England, Wales and Scotland for 1, 2, 3, 4 – 10, Belgium for 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and more, Denmark and Poland for 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and more Finland for 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and more, Holland for 1, 2 – 3, 4 – 5, 6 – 8, 9 – 12, 13 and more and finally Sweden for 1, 2, 3 and more relapses.

In the following (table 6) I give the average rates of dispersion calculated from 12 years' data of the above-mentioned 7 countries and the extent of deviations from average. The frequency of the first relapses shows great fluctuations in the individual countries: between 21,7% and 49,1%, the frequency of the second relapse between 17,5 and 21,3% the frequency of the third relapse between 10,3 and 13,3%. The frequency of three and more relapses in Sweden is 49,7%, the frequency of four and more relapses in England 47,5% in Holland 31,0%, the frequency of five and more relapses in the other countries falls between 12,4 and 24,9%.

There are relatively few comparable data available about the division of recidivists according to demographic criteria. The following data contain the division by sexes, to be more exact, the number of recidivists of the same sex per 100 convicts (table 7).

For this index there are also national data available so the data of the six countries can be compared with Hungarian ones too. In each country the male rate is essentially higher than the female one, the rate is about 3:2 in general. In Sweden 2:1 in Hungary 4:3. This index, however, depends not only on the division of recidivists according to sexes, but on that of all the convicts according to sexes: where the rate of women among the convicts is high there the number of recidivist women per 100 female convicts is smaller. When we examine the division of recidivists according to sexes, it will turn out that in England the rate is 96.5% and 3.1%, in Belgium 85.1% and 14.9%, in Denmark 95.2% and 4.8% and in Sweden the rate of men and women is 97.2% and 2.8%. In Hungary among 100 recidivists there are 87 men and 13 women. There are hardly any data referring to the age of recidivists and even the existing ones can hardly be compared, because similarly grouped age data of all the convicts and total population are not known. Most of the criminal statistics do not even give absolute numbers, but calculated data.

In Poland and Denmark, the statistics contain the number of the offenders with a past record among 100 convicts according to age groups.

Division of Recidivists by the Order of Recidivism

Table 6

(by the serial number of recidivism) (%)

Country		Rate of recidivists previously convicted					Altogether
		1	2	3	4	5 and more times	
England, Wales, Scotland	rate	21.7	17.5	13.3	47.5 ¹	—	100.0
	deviation	30.0	32.6	18.8	—	—	
Belgium	rate	40.5	20.1	12.0	7.6	19.7	100.0
	deviation	12.8	4.0	9.2	17.1	15.7	
Denmark	rate	39.5	19.8	11.9	7.7	21.2	100.0
	deviation	6.6	4.5	8.4	13.0	19.8	
Finland	rate	40.5	17.7	10.3	6.6	24.9	100.0
	deviation	4.9	7.3	4.7	6.5	12.6	
Holland	rate	37.4		31.6	31.0 ¹	—	100.0
	deviation	9.1		6.3	—	—	
Poland	rate	49.1	21.3	11.0	6.1	12.4	100.0
	deviation	38.1	16.4	39.0	52.5	64.5	
Sweden	rate	32.7	17.6	49.7 ²	—	—	100.0
	deviation	9.8	11.4	—	—	—	

¹ four and more² three and more

Frequency of Recidivists according to Sexes

Table 7

Year	Wales		Austria		Belgium		Denmark		Poland		Sweden		Hungary	
	Offender with a past record per 100 convicts													
	man	woman	man	wo-man	man	woman	man	wo-man	man	woman	man	woman	man	woman
1960			53	37	45.7	31.0					52.8	26.0		
1961	61.4	46.0	54	37	45.8	30.4	44	26			51.2	23.0		
1962	61.8	31.5	54	37	44.9	30.2	44	26			52.8	23.0	36.9	30.7
1963	66.4	38.5	55	37	47.1	29.8	43	25			53.8	30.5	35.8	35.4
1964	65.5	48.4	54	37	45.7	29.7	43	29			54.2	23.0	29.8	26.2
1965	63.3	38.7	53	34	45.5	30.8	43	22			54.3	27.6	27.8	22.3
1966	65.3	35.5	50	32	46.9	29.5	42	23			53.5	24.3	29.1	21.5
1967	65.5	52.7	50	32	48.2	30.5	44	24	30.9	13.9	54.0	26.4	31.0	23.2
1968	70.7	54.5			48.0	30.6	46	23	32.4	14.6	54.5	28.9	34.3	17.8
1969	68.6	49.4					45	25	33.7	15.2	53.8	28.9	33.5	25.4
1970	46.7	23.7							31.9	13.5	52.2	28.1	35.6	31.6
1971	50.4	26.0									53.1	29.6	28.2	21.5

The age groups are similar too, only the two extreme age groups do not correspond but the Polish data contain the rates of all the recidivists, the Danish data contain the data of male and female recidivists respectively, so they cannot be compared directly. The Polish data can mostly be compared with those of Hungary, therefore, in the next table the two countries' age-specific recidivism rates of 4-4 years and their global recidivism rates are summed up. (table 8) Grouping by age is not in accord either, the Polish distinguish age groups of 17-20 and 21-24, we do those of 18-19 and 20-24. As the absolute numbers of the Hungarian data are also known, the table was made with correction. In most age groups the Hungarian rate is several tenths higher than the corresponding Polish rates, except the year of 1968, when the Polish rates were higher in most of the age groups. The rates of Denmark referring to men are higher in all age groups than the Polish and Hungarian rates, while the female rates are essentially lower in all age groups.

Rate of Offenders with a Past Record by Age Groups

Table 8

Year		From 100 convicts offenders with a past record were						
		17-20	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-	In general
Poland	1967	17.9	26.3	34.0	36.5	28.9	18.0	28.6
	1968	19.3	26.8	35.8	38.3	31.4	19.4	30.1
	1969	20.6	29.6	37.8	40.4	32.5	19.6	31.0
	1970	20.3	28.2	34.7	38.3	31.6	17.3	29.9
Hungary	1967	18.9	29.3	34.2	35.7	31.9	23.2	28.8
	1968	20.3	30.2	33.4	34.4	28.9	18.6	28.9
	1969	19.2	32.4	36.4	39.8	34.7	28.9	32.4
	1970	18.8	35.4	40.1	44.7	39.0	27.6	35.1

Age-specific Rate of Recidivists

Table 9

Year		Recidivists falling to 100 000 persons of the same age					
		-21	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-	In general
Holland	1965	84	248	161	118	58	127
	1966	112	251	177	116	60	136
	1967	128	250	178	115	60	140
	1970	151	237	164	104	45	135
Hungary	1965	135	397	384	210	49	208
	1966	167	439	420	244	51	231
	1967	206	490	422	235	48	243
	1970	163	410	356	167	29	195

The data of Holland contain the number of recidivists per 100.000 inhabitants of the same age. In the following table I try to compare them with the Hungarian data of the same age (table 9).

Considering that there is an essential difference in the order of magnitude of crime and recidivism between the two countries, the comparison of age groups reflects deviation of the same magnitude. It would be interesting to compare the crimes committed by recidivists but here again the

Table 10

Frequency of Recidivism in Offences against Property

Year	Austria ¹	Belgium ²	Denmark	Greece	Holland ³	Italy ⁴	Portugal ⁵	Sweden
1960					45.9		11.1	
1961	25.0	45.7	45		43.5	55.3		
1962	24.2	43.1	45		41.9	53.3	16.2	50.9
1963	23.4	44.9	47		41.5	57.6		52.0
1964	25.8	44.3	46	16.8	42.9	51.7	20.9	53.4
1965	25.9	46.2	45	19.3	41.8	50.0		54.4
1966	23.8		47	17.5	41.0	53.1	16.9	53.4
1967	22.5		48	15.6	41.4	55.1		54.3
1968	22.6	46.5	47	14.6	42.1	50.9	14.1	54.9
1969	23.6		45	36.4	43.5	50.5		55.0
1970	23.7			36.7	45.4	52.2	12.8	54.3
1971				34.5				
1972							12.5	

¹ only theft

² theft, robbery, receiving stolen goods, embezzlement and fraud (gen. and. spec. together)

³ theft and burglary

⁴ theft, robbery, fraud

⁵ special recidivists

Table 11

Frequency of Recidivism among Offenders Causing Bodily Harm

Year	Denmark ¹	Greece ²	Holland ³
1960			46.7
1961	32		47.3
1962	33		47.6
1963	30		47.3
1964	33	21.9	46.9
1965	32	21.1	47.3
1966	32	20.9	47.5
1967	31	13.8	46.0
1968	32	10.8	48.5
1969	36	32.6	47.4
1970		33.6	48.8
1971		31.2	

¹ Violent crimes

Against persons

² without grievous bodily harm

³

Table 12

Sentences Meted out to Offenders with and without a Past Record (%)

	Country, year	Loss of Liberty					Fine	Other	Total	
		months			1 year	To- gether				Sus- pended
		-3	3-6	6-12						
Aust- ria	1967 With a past record	26.8	6.1	3.9	2.2	54	.	42	4	100
	1967 With a clean record	4.8	1.0	0.7	0.5	29	.	68	3	100
Holland	Recidivist	24	45		15	84	.	16	-	100
	1967 With a past record	19	14		3	36	.	61	3	100
	1967 With a clean record	8	7		1	16	.	77	7	100
	Recidivist	29	42		7	78	.	22	-	100
	1970 With a past record	20	14		2	36	.	61	3	100
	1970 With a clean record	10	6		1	17	.	76	7	100
Norway	1970 With a past record	45.9	17.5	21.6	5.5	90.5	35.7	6.3	3.2	100
	1970 With a clean record	52.8	7.9	6.1	1.4	68.2	52.7	23.0	8.8	100
	1971 With a past record	44.7	18.0	21.5	5.7	89.9	35.0	6.8	3.3	100
	1971 With a clean record	50.4	7.5	6.0	1.2	65.1	50.4	25.8	9.1	100
Italy	1967 With a past record	28.8	21.7	16.8	32.7	100.0	13.3	.	.	.
	1967 With a clean record	34.2	28.3	16.1	21.4	100.0	72.9	.	.	.

different nomenclatures of different crimes cause the difficulty. So I tried to attempt to compare such crimes which cannot have any essential notional differences.

Table 10 shows offences against property on the basis of 8 countries' data, table 11 shows the data of bodily harm on the basis of the data of three countries. Offences against property play an important part in most countries' criminal law, the imposes more serious sanctions on recidivists committing offences against property. The rate of recidivists is the highest in Italy and Sweden, the lowest is in Portugal. The comparison of Austrian data is rather difficult because they contain only recidivists in theft. In Czechoslovakia, the rate of recidivists committing offences against property was 58.1% in 1957. In Poland the rate was 16.7% in 1970. Only three countries Denmark, Greece and Holland give data for recidivists committing bodily harm. The rate of recidivists is the highest in Holland among them. In Greece the rate is very changing. In Czechoslovakia the rate of recidivists committing bodily harm was 47.7% in 1967 and 7.0% in Poland, in 1970.

Except England the criminal law of each country inflicts a more serious punishment upon recidivists than upon first offenders. In the following table the data of the imposing of punishment in different countries can be seen concerning recidivists and offenders with a clean record respectively (table 12).

The data of all the four examined countries reflect that the rate of fine and suspended imprisonment is essentially higher in case first offenders than of recidivists. The rate of loss of liberty is higher in each time category in case of recidivists than of first offenders, except groups smaller than three months, where the number of suspended loss of liberty raises the rate.

IV.

The following lessons can be drawn from the examination of the given data:

1. International comparison can be carried out in an exact way only if a uniform nomenclature — at least for certain fundamental notions — is available.
2. The elaboration of the method should be urged on by the Interpol or by an other international organization.
3. In the last century similar difficulties were caused by the comparison of mortality statistics. The individual countries defined deaths in a different way. The elaborated and internationally accepted nomenclature of the causes of death furnished a basis for comparison. A similar procedure could be adopted to elaborate and introduce nomenclatures of crimes too.
4. I think the observation of demographic criteria does not meet with any particular difficulties in any countries. The studied sources of data show that in spite of this, collection of data concerning demog-

raphic data of offenders occurs only in a few countries even in those countries data at best on sex and age can be found but there are hardly any data on the marital status, occupation, education of the offenders.

5. Hungary too, by having joined the Interpol, could initiate research into international comparison. I believe international comparison of this kind would be useful for organs fighting against crime and administering justice in all countries.

Sources of Data:

Annuario di Statistiche Giudiziarie, Istituto Centrale di Statistica, Roma
 Annuario Statistico Italiano, Istituto Centrale di Statistica Roma
 Criminal Statistics, England and Wales, Her Majesty's Stationery Office,
 London

Criminal Statistics, Scotland Her Majesty's Stationery Office, Edinburgh
 Criminele Statistiek

Estatísticas De Justicia Instituto Nacional De Estadística

Maandstatistiek van Rechtswezen

Kriminalni Statisticka verejne bezpečenosti Praha

Kriminalstatistik Danmarks Statistisk, København

Kriminalstatistik Del. 1. Polisstatistik

Kriminalstatistik Del. 2. Domstols — och aklagerstatistik

Statistika Centralbyran, Stockholm

Kriminalstatistikk Domfelte Statistisk Sentralbyrå, Oslo

Kriminalstatistikk Forbrytelser Etterforsket av Politiet Statistisk Sentralbyrå, Oslo

Statistická recenka kriminality Praha

Statistique Criminelle de la Belgique, Institut National de Statistique,
 Bruxelles

Statistique Judiciaire, 1968. Institut National de Statistique, Bruxelles

Statistisches Jahrbuch für die Bundesrepublik, Statistisches Bundesamt,
 Wiesbaden

Statystyka Sadiva czesc Ministerstwo Sprawiedliwosci, Warszawa

Die Strafurteile in der Schweiz Eidgenössisches Statistisches Amt Bern

Tuomioistuinten Tutkimat Rikokset Suomen Viallinen Tilasto

LITERATURE

¹ Akman, Dogan-Normandeau, André: Statistiques criminelles internationales et les cas d'un indice pondéré extralégal: Revue de Science Criminelle et droit Pénal Comparé, Tome 23, 1968. 309—319. p.

² Ancel, Marc: Observations on the international comparison of criminal statistics; International Review of Criminal Policy, 1952. 41—48. p.

³ Dr. Antal Bakóczy: Az élet elleni bűnözés alakulása az egyes országokban. (The Tendency of Crimes against Life in Different Countries.) Belügyi Szemle Tájékoztatója, No. 25. 1977. 33—40. p.

- ⁴ A. Bosco: La Delinquenza in Vari Stati di Europa, Bulletin de l'Institut International de Statistique, Tom. XIII. 1903. Roma, 19—298. p.
- ⁵ Collman, Hans-Jürgen von: Internationale Kriminalstatistik, Ferdinand Enke Verlag, Stuttgart 1973. 120 p.
- ⁶ Gini, C.—Spallanzani, A.: Sulla comparazione dei dati di Statistica Criminale dei diversi Stati. Bulletin de L'Institut International de Statistique, Tom. XXVI. 1931. Madrid, 705—718. p.
- ⁷ Hacker, Ervin: Les methodes de la statistique comparée de la criminalité; Stepanum, Budapest, 1938.
- ⁸ Hacker, Ervin: Kriminalstatistische und Kriminalaetiologische Berichte, Stephan Ludvig, Miskolc, 1941. Heft 10—12., 152 p.
- ⁹ Jescheck, Hans Heinrich—Grebing, Gerhardt: Die Geldstrafe in deutschen und ausländischen Recht, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden, 1978. 1358 p.
- ¹⁰ Kovacsicsné Nagy Katalin—Kovacsics József: La comparaison internationale de la criminalité, Bulletin of the 40th Session of the International Statistical Institute, Contributed Papers. Warszawa, 1975. 476—481. p.
- ¹¹ Normandeau, A.: A crime index for England and 10 other countries, Criminologist 1970. Vol. V. No. 16—17. 63—71. p.
- ¹² Normandeau, A.: A comparative study of the weighted crime indices for eight countries, Int. crim. Police Rev. 1970. 25/234. 15—18. p.
- ¹³ Dr. Antal Patera: Gondolatok a bűnözés és a bűnismétlők adatainak nemzetközi összehasonlításához. (Ideas to the International Comparison of Data of Crime and Recidivists.) Kriminológiai és Kriminalisztikai tanulmányok, Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, Budapest, 1980. 331—373. p.
- ¹⁴ Rangol, Alfred-Johannes: Der Internationale Kriminalitätsvergleich, Monatschrift für Kriminologie und Strafrechtsreform, Vol. 48. 1965. 114—137. p.
- ¹⁵ Dr. Raskó Gabriella: A női kriminalitás alakulása és jelentősége, Belügyi Szemle Tájékoztatója, No. 25. 1977. 40—45. p.
- ¹⁶ Reimann, Wilhelm: Die internationale Vergleichbarkeit der Kriminalstatistik: (Diss. phil.) Leipzig, 1931.
- ¹⁷ Roesner, Ernst: Die internationale Kriminalstatistik in ihrer methodischen Entwicklung, Allgemeines Statistisches Archiv, Vol. 22. No. 1. 1932. 17—44. p.
- ¹⁸ Schindhelm, Malte: Der Sellin-Wolfgang-Index-ein ergänzendes Mass der Strafrechtspflegestatistik; Enke, Stuttgart: 1972.
- ¹⁹ Sellin, Thorsten: International Criminal Statistica; Criminologica, Vol. 5. 1967(b): 2—11. p.
- ²⁰ Verkko, Veli: International Comparison of Criminal Statistics; Nordisk Tidsskrift for Kriminalvidenskab, Vol. 39. 1951. 109—119. p.
- ²¹ Wolfgang, Marvin E.: International Criminal Statistics; Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, Vol. 58. 1967. 65—69. p.

VERSUCH EINES INTERNATIONALEN VERGLEICHES VON STATISTISCHEN DATEN DER KRIMINALITÄT

Frau KOVACSICS, KATALIN NAGY

Der internationale Vergleich von kriminalstatistischen Daten beschäftigt die Kriminalstatistiker schon seit Jahrzehnten. Die Experten der Kriminalwissenschaften erwarten das objektive Vergleichen der Kriminalität verschiedener Länder selbstverständlich von der Statistik.

Der Vergleich der Kriminalität ist viel komplizierter als der Vergleich von wirtschaftlichen, demographischen, oder anderen gesellschaftlichen Erscheinungen, da die Kriminalität eine komplexe Massenerscheinung ist, deren Gestaltung die Zahl und Zusammensetzung der Bevölkerung, die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung, die gesellschaftliche Einrichtung, die moralischen Verhältnisse und das Klima gleichermaßen beeinflussen. Außer diesen materiellen Faktoren beeinflussen die Kriminalität, vermittelt auch die kriminalstatistischen Daten die sogenannten formalen Faktoren: zum Beispiel die verschiedenen Strafgesetzbücher der einzelnen Länder verursachen bei dem Vergleich der Kriminalität sogar von Völkern mit ähnlicher Gesellschaftsordnung viele technische Schwierigkeiten.

Außerdem macht den Vergleich der Daten noch komplizierter, daß in den einzelnen Ländern auch das System und die Einheit der statistischen Beobachtung verschieden sind; die Gruppierungsgesichtspunkte sowie die Bearbeitungssysteme sind anders.

Verfasser befaßt sich im ersten Teil seines Artikels gründlich mit der einheimischen und ausländischen Literatur des Themas, besonders hervorgehoben die diesbezügliche Tätigkeit des Internationalen Statistischen Instituts.

Im zweiten Teil des Artikels wird die Kriminalität von 18 Ländern, mitunter von Ungarn zwischen 1960 und 1972 mit Anwendung von rohen und gereinigten Verhältniszahlen verglichen.

Im dritten Teil befaßt sich der Verfasser mit einem besonderen Gebiet der Kriminalität, dem Vergleich der Rückfälligen; legt das Verhältnis der Rückfälligen in den einzelnen Ländern dar, untersucht eingehend die Abweichungen in der gesetzlichen Regelung der Rückfälligkeit. Während der Untersuchung der Rückfälligen werden die Häufigkeit der allgemeinen und speziellen Rückfälligkeit, die Rückfälligkeitsreihenfolge, die demographischen Besonderheiten, sowie die über die Rückfälligen verhängten Strafen analysiert.

Letztens macht der Verfasser im vierten und letzten Teil des Artikels Vorschläge für die Organisation der internationalen Kriminalstatistik und für die Entwicklung ihrer Methoden.

ПОПЫТКА СРАВНИТЕЛЬНОГО АНАЛИЗА ДАННЫХ МЕЖДУНАРОДНОЙ КРИМИНОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ СТАТИСТИКИ

КОВАЧИЧНЕ НАДЬ КАТАЛИН

(Резюме)

Специалисты криминологической статистики на протяжении многих десятилетий занимаются сравнительным анализом статистических данных преступности. Таким образом понятно, что объективного сравнительного анализа данных преступности разных стран криминологи ожидают от статистики.

Сравнение данных преступности — более сложная проблема, чем сравнение экономических, демографических или других общественных явлений, в силу того, что преступность представляет собой комплексное общественное массовое явление, которое в равной мере определяется численностью и составом населения, уровнем экономического развития, общественным и моральными условиями, географическим расположением и климатом данной страны и т. д. Помимо этих материальных факторов на преступность, и таким образом косвенно и на статистические данные преступности влияют и т. н. формальные факторы, т. е. различные уголовные кодексы отдельных стран, причиняющие много технических трудностей даже при сравнении преступности народов стран с одинаковым общественным строем.

Кроме всего этого сравнительный анализ данных осложняется и тем, что в отдельных странах статистическая система различна, неодинаковы единицы наблюдения, принципы группировки, системы обработки данных.

В первой части работы автор подробно занимается отечественной и зарубежной литературой по этой теме, в особенности работами Международного института статистики в этой области.

Во второй части с помощью сырых и очищенных коэффициентов сравнивается преступность 18 европейских стран, в том числе и Венгрии, за 1960–72 гг.

В третьей части автор занимается особой частью преступности, т. е. сравнением рецидивной преступности, приводит данные пропорционального соотношения рецидивистов в отдельных странах, уделяя особое внимание различиям в юридической регулировке рецидива.

В ходе изучения автор подвергает анализу частоту общего и специального рецидива очередность рецидива, демографические особенности рецидивистов и наказания назначаемые для них.

И наконец в четвертой, заключительной части автор вносит предложения по организации международной статистики преступности и разработке ее методов.